

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	MAIL STOP
Akihiko Umeno et al.)	
Application No.: 10/635,716)	Group Art Unit: 3736
Filed: August 7, 2003)	Examiner: Emily M. Lloyd
For: GUIDE WIRE)	Confirmation No.: 1956
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Official Action of October 28, 2008, indicates that the claims in this application are directed to two different Groups. As identified in the Official Action, the different Groups are as follows:

Group I, recited in Claims 1-22, drawn to a guidewire; and

Group II, recited in Claims 23-34, drawn to a method of making a guidewire.

Based on the observation that the two inventions are distinct from one another, a restriction requirement has been imposed requiring an election of one of the two inventions.

Applicants hereby elect Group II, recited in Claims 23-34, with traverse.

Further, the Official Action indicates that Group II contains claims directed to patentably distinct Species, and requires an election of Species. The Official Action identifies the different Species as follows:

Species A, wherein the cross-sectional area of the end face of the first end portion of the second wire is less than the cross-sectional area of the end face of the first end portion of the first wire before welding; and

Species B, wherein the cross-sectional area of the end face of the first end portion of the second wire is less than the cross-sectional area of the end face of the first end portion after welding.

Applicants hereby elect Species B, with traverse. Claims 23-27, 29, 30 and 32-34 are readable on the elected species.

The election of Group II and Species B is made with traverse because it is believed that all of the claims of this application can be examined without a serious search and examination burden. A similar restriction requirement was made in the Official Action dated February 28, 2007. In the subsequent Official Action, dated August 6, 2007, the Restriction Requirement between Groups I and II was withdrawn. Thus, Claims 1-27, 29, 30 and 32-34 were examined on the merits. Because the Examiner has previously determined that a restriction between the inventions of Groups I and II is not necessary, and Claims 1-27, 29, 30 and 32-34 have been examined on the merits, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no serious search and examination burden. With regard to the Restriction Requirement between Species A and B, Applicants respectfully submit that the search required for elected species would be coextensive with the search for the non-elected species.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this Restriction Requirement.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned counsel for Applicants regarding the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 26, 2008 By: Peter J. ChVan,
for Reg. No. 60361,
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32814

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620